Evaluating HOPE VI – Charlotte, NC

by

Sukyoung Kim

A Masters Project submitted to the faculty
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of City and Regional Planning
in the Department of City and Regional Planning

Chapel Hill

April 2014

Approved by:

_____

READER (optional) PRINT NAME ADVISOR SIGNATURE

ABSTRACT

The objective of this paper is to find out how to evaluate a HOPE VI outcome in a specific area. In order to do this, several previous studies are reviewed to understand different evaluations and findings. Further, this paper addresses how HOPE VI programs in Charlotte should be evaluated. For this evaluation to be successful, the indicators used in previous studies are examined. Six different indicators are selected considering both residents' quality of life and neighborhood conditions. Moreover, HOPE VI sites and control sites in Charlotte are selected based on developed year, neighborhood size, median household income, and distance. According to site selection, two HOPE VI sites and eight control sites are chosen. Finally, additional research is conducted to assess the exact HOPE VI findings: long-term studies, comprehensive community plans, and residents' self-sufficiency programs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my special thanks to the Roberto Quercia and all of the kind and nice colleagues at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for their knowledge, inspiration, and enthusiasm: Hyesung Han, Jun Huh, and Sierra Bainter. Their guidance and encouragement over the past six months helped me to do this research project harder.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

As the first housing program targeting low-income families, Public Housing was enacted in 1937 to solve social ills in a slum and provide residents with decent homes (Von Hoffman, 2010). The federal government, however, started realizing that public housing had been associated with chronic problems: physical deterioration, high crime rates, low employment, welfare dependency, inadequate services, and high poverty concentration (Curley, 2010). For these problems to be solved, the HOPE VI program was created in 1993. This program is basically public housing revitalization, building up mixed-income neighborhoods and offering community education.

Since HOPE VI was activated, an evaluation has been started to assess HOPE VI success. This evaluation is necessary to know how well the program has worked since its beginning and how well the HOPE VI goals have been met (Popkin, 2002). According to four main studies reviewed in this paper, some of the outcomes varied greatly while others were similar. For example, return rates after HOPE VI ranged from less than 10% to 75% (Popkin, 2010). In this sense, the HOPE VI evaluation is hard to generalize because each site or city could show different findings.

Even if the HOPE VI outcome cannot be generalized, it is possible for HOPE VI programs in Charlotte, Mecklenburg County to be evaluated. Based on the previous studies and the Quality of Life indicators created by Charlotte, this paper considers several indicators focusing both on original residents and neighborhood conditions. Finally, it covers implications for planners to evaluate HOPE VI.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

HISTORY OF PUBLIC HOUSING

The first purpose of low-income housing assistance programs was to improve living conditions for low-income families by providing them with safe and secure shelters. In order to achieve this goal, America opened the initial housing policy with the 1937 U.S. Housing Act by paying attention to public housing production. Also, the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) was created in 1938 to provide a funding structure. With the Housing Act and the funding organization established, the federal government started to build up public housing. At the time, it was widely believed that public housing production could solve health and mental problems for those who lived in slums. Moreover, it was expected to help poor working class renters move where they could find jobs (Stoloff, 2004). To clear slums and boost the economy, the federal government invested money for new construction and contracted with local housing agencies to build up public housing. This program dominated the housing policy market until 1973 when President Nixon suspended public housing due to concerns about huge funding (Landis, 2010).

The main concern for halting this program was financial but more than that, the results of the program were unexpected and gave President Nixon good reason to suspend. Because of limited construction funding, the locations were far away from the city where job were dispersed. The housing quality was also substandard, and management fees to maintain standard conditions were getting more costly than many residents could afford. Moreover, the social and economic problems had not been solved in the way the federal government anticipated. Because of these unexpected outcomes, it was obvious that public housing had not guaranteed quality of life to low-income residents (Freeman, 2003).

This was why the federal government stopped new public housing production. Instead, it has been gradually replaced with voucher programs since 1973.

The objective of voucher programs is to provide housing opportunities for more low-income families. These programs have helped relocate low-income families out of neighborhoods with high concentrations of low-income households (Mast, 2013). Voucher programs have two strong points compared with public housing: the first is less money invested to help a large number of families at a reasonable cost per family (Grigsby, 2004); and the second is residents can choose where to live (Landis, 2010). With these strong points, voucher holders increased from 1.8 million in 2001 to 2.1 million in 2004. The total units of public housing, however, declined by 12% from 1.4 million units in 1993 to 1.2 million units in 2004 throughout the nation (Schwartz, 2006). Considering the total number of households that benefited from each program, voucher programs had relatively more beneficiaries than public housing programs (Grigsby, 2004). Despite this likely successful substitute for low-income housing programs, the chronic problems of public housing remained. Compared with public housing, voucher programs helped the government to subsidize housing assistance programs in a cost effective way since the government does not necessarily pay for land and new construction. As a result, more households have benefited from this program. In one sense, public housing and vouchers similarly targeted low-income families, but this does not mean that the latter could make up for the drawbacks of public housing. Even with vouchers created, it was impossible to solve two problems caused by public housing getting old: distressed public housing conditions and residents' quality of life in the neighborhoods.

BACKGROUND OF HOPE VI

Distressed Public Housing

Instead of building up new public housing, vouchers have been the low-income housing assistance programs since 1973. Although these programs have served more low-income households, they have not helped public housing deterioration. This is because voucher programs are based on demands while public housing is a supply-based model with new production. As they get old, distressed public housing needs to be demolished and redeveloped. Since public housing has been associated with not only physical deterioration, but also other chronic problems such as high crime rates, low employment, welfare dependency, inadequate services, and high poverty concentration, HOPE VI was created by the Clinton administration in 1993 (Schwartz, 2006). Essentially, severely distressed public housing communities have been transformed into planned neighborhoods with the HOPE VI program (Fogel, 2008).

Objectives and Scopes of HOPE VI

On behalf of public housing revitalization, the major objectives of HOPE VI are: *[1]

- To improve the physical shape of public housing;
- To establish positive incentives for resident self-sufficiency and comprehensive services that empower residents;
- To decrease poverty concentrations by placing public housing in non-poverty neighborhoods and to promote mixed-income communities; and

1 The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development HOPE VI: http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/public_indian_housing/programs/ph/hope6/about

- To encourage partnerships with other agencies, local governments, nonprofit organizations, and private businesses to leverage support and resources.

For these objectives to be successful, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) planned to fund 254 HOPE VI revitalization grants totaling more than $6.7 billion from 1993 to 2010[*2]. This included various activities both on and off the original HOPE VI sites: demolition, revitalization, main street, and supportive services. Through this program, HUD planned to demolish approximately 78,000 units of distressed public housing and to develop a total of roughly 83,000 units. This figure included about 62,000 units of rental housing and 21,000 homeownership units (Popkin, 2002). In addition to physical improvement on the sites, HOPE VI also offered relocation and Community Supportive Service to original residents (Holin, 2003).

For effective relocation services, original residents typically have two choices: either move with a voucher or move to other public housing developments. They are also allowed to return after revitalization unless they fail screening criteria such as employment, drug testing, and criminal history. Most of the redevelopments, however, have often been delayed so some sites have staged relocation plans and allowed original residents to stay on-site during the redevelopment. Thus, this could help residents who wish to come back to the revitalized site to not necessarily move off-site (Popkin, 2004). Given the relocation options and efforts for original tenants, the return rate of original tenants was treated as an important indicator to tell whether or not the project was successful. However, even with an attempt to increase return rates of the original residents, the return rate decreased from 61% in 1999 to 44% in 2003 on average. This was because only 48,800 units were planned as public housing although 94,600 public housing units were demolished and 95,100 units were redeveloped from 1993 to 2003 (Schwartz, 2006; Popkin, 2004).

2 The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development: HOPE VI Grants Awarded

A huge difference between the public housing and HOPE VI programs is the investment of about $714 million towards Community and Supportive Service. This is a combination of housing assistance and social services. For residents' self-sufficiency, this service provides computer learning centers, day care facilities, after-school programs, job training programs, and the like. Depending on the quality of the programs and resident population, the outcomes vary significantly (Popkin, 2004). For example, New Holly residents in Seattle tended to be more employed after the Campus of Leaners was created (Clegg and Associates, 2000). Similarly, Chatham Estates residents in Chester, Pennsylvania who participated in the supportive services had an improvement in crime three times greater than those who did not (Widener University, 2003). On the other hand, the Service Connector System in Chicago which introduced job opportunities was not enough to meet the residents' needs because of higher caseloads (Sullivan, 2003). More than advantages and disadvantages from these services, it is hard to evaluate how successful the programs are at helping residents' self-sufficiency without a systematic national evaluation or data. Therefore, uniform measures should be required to evaluate how well the Community Supportive Service matches with HOPE VI program goals (Popkin, 2004).

In order to create revitalized societies, the HOPE VI program is designed to both improve blighted public housing areas physically and encourage residents' self-sufficiency. For this to be successful, HOPE VI has been pursuing physical updates after demolition and residents' relocation. Also, individuals in the society have been educated through Community and Supportive Services.

Impacts of HOPE VI

The HOPE VI program has impacted physical public housing conditions, public housing residents, and neighborhood conditions as a whole. First of all, HOPE VI helps to transform high-rise buildings with small units and lacked amenities into smaller and lower-density developments encouraged by new

urbanism. Based on designs with open spaces and enhanced landscaping, HOPE VI sites have received plenty of awards*[3] (Popkin, 2004). According to the Interim Assessment study, distressed public housing has been improved in four positive ways: lower density, connecting properties to the surrounding area through sidewalks and street grids, increased safety with private entrances, and improved exteriors such as bay windows, porches, or roofs. With these improvements, most of the HOPE VI sites incorporated new urbanism and defensible space principles (Holin, 2003). Not only has HOPE VI improved physical conditions, but it has also helped to create a healthier society with mixed-income strategies targeting high-income households for some of the units both on and off sites. Another improvement of HOPE VI sites is an innovative management system using private management firms. Through this, the revitalized sites have been well managed and maintained since their completion (Popkin, 2004).

What is more important than physical improvements is whether or not original residents benefit from this program, because it could impact on program continuity. For this redevelopment, residents are usually relocated to either other public housing or private housing with vouchers. Thus, return rates after revitalization have been considered a critical indicator to evaluate the success of HOPE VI. Not surprisingly, the result depends on how many public housing units are in the revitalized site and whether or not the residents are still eligible for the unit. There are some critics who say return rates only partially indicate HOPE VI success because some of the residents moving with vouchers are better off and satisfied with their lives (Popkin, 2004).

Finally, HOPE VI revitalization also contributes to the overall neighborhood conditions surrounding the site through a number of factors: improvement in community infrastructure: decrease in crime, unemployment, and poverty rates; and increase in housing values. In terms of infrastructure, HOPE VI developments are more likely to have schools, parks, libraries, and police stations, as well as commercial facilities. Through these improvements, residents can easily access public services and

3 http://housingresearch.wordpress.com

amenities. Furthermore, the Housing Research Foundation study (HRF) showed decrease in crime rates, unemployment rates, and concentrated poverty (Zielenbach, 2002). This study assessed eight different communities: Techwood (Atlanta), Orchard Park (Boston), Earle Village (Chalotte), Quigg Newton (Denver), Kennedy Brothers (El Paso), Hillside Terrace (Milwaukee), Richard Allen Homes (Philadelphia), and Holly Park (Seattle). Based on the analysis from these sites, violent crime rates decreased 30% faster in these sites than they did in the cities as a whole. Also, unemployment fell by 10% on average and poverty rates dropped from 81% in 1989 to 69% in 1999. Lastly, housing values around HOPE VI sites have increased after revitalization. For example, since the First Ward Place development in Charlotte has been completed, real estate values for surrounding parcels have skyrocketed (Popkin, 2004). In this sense, it is true that the HOPE VI program has shown positive impacts on some residents and communities. The findings, however, vary site by site so it is hard to apply the average outcomes to all projects.

Successes and Failures

It is hard to decide whether or not a HOPE VI program is successful because neighborhood change in numerous and complex ways (Popkin, 2004). Also, the outcomes vary significantly depending on the site and how success is defined. Despite of these analytic complexities and ambiguous definitions of success, the program helps to improve distressed public housing conditions, residents' quality of life, and surrounding neighborhoods to some extent. To be specific, higher density buildings built up with shoddy construction have been updated to low-rise buildings with improved materials. In addition, the programs help original residents to improve quality of life by moving with vouchers or returning after HOPE VI. At the level of the overall neighborhoods, HOPE VI also helps to alleviate crime,

unemployment, and poverty rates. Even with these successful findings, the HOPE VI program also has some critics.

Firstly, HOPE VI is designed to improve physical public housing conditions so it is necessary to relocate original residents and rebuild new housing. In the relocation process, however, former residents can lose social ties such as food banks, social service agencies, and clinics they used to have. Because of this separation, many residents feel lonely and isolated after being relocated (Barrett, 2003). Also, the redevelopment process has often been delayed in some HOPE VI sites due to mismanagement, litigation, and complex financial challenges (Popkin, 2004). Furthermore, even after the revitalization of mixed-income sites is complete, the interaction between higher- and lower-income residents is likely superficial. For this reason, creating a mixed-income community does not show any positive impacts for the low-income (Brophy, 1997). For example, there is no difference in the passion to find a job between the poor who live in a mixed-income neighborhood and those who do not reside there (Rogenbaum, 1998). This means that high-income families do not inspire low-income families in terms of job search and secure settlement. When it comes to residents' quality of life, return rates are usually used as an indicator. Sometimes return rates are low because of a reduction in public housing units or strict eligibility requirements (Popkin, 2004). The low return rates do not always mean the HOPE VI program was a failure because the program seemed to benefit voucher movers to some extent. Not surprisingly, however, when residents moved out to private housing units, they had obvious struggles with high rent and utilities that used to be covered in public housing. For these complicated relocations and returns, HOPE VI programs have received both support and criticism.

With these advantages and disadvantages of the HOPE VI program, the program evaluation should be conducted in many different ways given the background and circumstances around each neighborhood.

PRIOR HOPE VI EVALUATIONS

The Five-Site Panel Study (Popkin, 2002)

Research Question

The Five-Site Panel Study was commissioned by Congress in 1999 to evaluate the lives of original residents in severely distressed public housing. In five sample HOPE VI sites from throughout the nation, the study covered seven issues: housing outcomes, neighborhood outcomes, social integration, adult health outcomes, child outcomes, socioeconomic outcomes, and relocation.

Site Selection

For site selection, four indicators were used: geographic diversity, public housing units out of total revitalized housing, diversity of city size, and HUD Public Housing Management and Administration (PHMAP) scores. Screened by this process, eighteen sites were chosen in the first stage. After reaching out to the 18 housing authorities, some sites where relocation had already been done were also eliminated because it was difficult to keep contacting original residents. After these screening processes, a sample of five sites was finally selected: Shore Park (Shore Terrace), Atlantic City, NJ; Ida B. Madden (Wells), Chicago, IL; Few Gardens, Durham, NC; Easter Hill, Richmond, CA; and East Capitol Dwellings, Washington, D.C.

Data Collection

Distressed public housing conditions before HOPE VI in the five different sites were assessed in three different ways: site visits, resident surveys, and in-depth interviews. Specifically, a sample of 887 heads of households was selected for survey during 48 months. Also, 39 adults and 39 youth between the ages of 10 and 14 were chosen for detailed interviews.

Outcomes

In line with the research question, the study assessed seven different conditions: housing, neighborhood, social integration, adult physical and mental health, children outcomes, employment status, and relocation.

In terms of physical housing improvements, Shore Park (Shore Terrace) and Wells (Madden) had some serious problems at a rate over 50%. Specifically, 54% of the Shore Park (Shore Terrace) residents thought that broken heating was a serious problem while about 54% of the Wells (Madden) residents took water leaks and peeling paint problems seriously. Also, 76% of the Wells (Madden) residents said their housing had two or more problems. In spite of these problems, more than 67% of the respondents said they were satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their housing units. Typically, older adults were more satisfied with their housing than younger adults.

Given the overall neighborhood conditions, HOPE VI developments were typically located in extremely poor, segregated, high-crime neighborhoods. With low rates of owning a car, however, residents easily got access to public transit within 15 minutes. Yet, clinics and hospitals were not relatively close to where residents lived. Also, half of the residents in Few Gardens and East Hill struggled with long travels to grocery stores. In terms of neighborhood problems, social disorder ranked first and the survey also showed that selling drugs was a serious problem in the communities.

The social integration indicator assessed how often residents interacted with each other in each neighborhood. According to the survey and interviews, people in the neighborhood generally got along with each other in Wells (Madden) and Easter Hill. Shore Park (Shore Terrace) residents, however, indicated very weak connections within the neighborhood.

Similar to the poor physical conditions, the physical and mental health of adults in the Panel Study sites also stayed lower than the overall health of minorities at the national level. For instance, only 38% of the respondents in the study sites reported that they were in excellent or very good health while

the national figures were 60%[*4]. Likewise, living conditions impacted residents' mental health. According to the survey, approximately 29% of the respondents said they struggled with poor mental health which was much higher than the national average (19%). In addition, about 17% of residents indicated that they had experienced depression for the last 12 months.

Not only were adults in trouble with physical and mental health, but also children had similar struggles. According to the parents' responses, 69% of the children under age 6 were in excellent or very good health and 62% of them between 6 and 14 were in excellent or very good condition. Both groups were slightly lower than national samples. In order to measure children's mental health, parents were asked a series of six specific questions related with their mental health: troubles with teachers, disobedience in school, hanging out with friends in trouble, bullying, being restless or overly active, and being unhappy or depressed. Nearly 67% of them had two or more problems that were relatively higher percentage than poor children nationwide (57%)[*5]. Also, interviews indicated children were seriously segregated both economically and racially.

Employment status can also be used as an indicator in order to recognize residents' self-efficiency. According to the survey, Shore Park (Shore Terrace) residents had the highest percentage of full-time employees (45.3%) while only 18.8% of the Wells (Madden) residents had full-time jobs. Nearly 80% of respondents earned $15,000 or less for a yearly household income. Therefore, most residents had difficulty affording food and other living expenses because of low employment rates and salary.

Before HOPE VI revitalization, residents can choose to move to either other public housing developments or market rental housing with vouchers. Once revitalization is complete, they are allowed to move back to the neighborhood depending on the number of public housing units and resident eligibility. According to the survey, residents' desires to come back to the neighborhood varied by the

4 National Health Interview Survey (NHIS), 2001
5 National Health Interview Survey (NHIS)

site. For example, 81% of Wells (Madden) residents wanted to return after redevelopment while only 41.3% of Few Gardens residents hoped to move back.

In summary, the five sites used to be distressed with two or more physical problems before revitalization. Ironically, nearly 67% of residents felt satisfied with the conditions in spite of these distressed conditions. This study also found out most of the neighborhoods were situated in impoverished areas leaving them isolated from public services and grocery stores. This affected physical and mental health for both adults and children in a negative way. These five sample sites had high unemployment rates and salary was low although some residents had full time jobs.

Study Contributions

A huge contribution of this Panel Study is to establish indicators that can be used for HOPE VI projects to evaluate pre and post HOPE VI outcomes. Moreover, various outcomes in the five public housing sites throughout the nation showed different characteristics of each neighborhood. This can help researchers understand not only why each site has different outcomes after HOPE VI but also changes in outcomes between pre and post HOPE VI, potentially more valuable than the outcome itself.

New Evidence from the HOPE VI Panel Study (Popkin, 2010)

Relocation

This study showed changes in original residents' quality of life after HOPE VI revitalization depending on how they were relocated, mostly based on the panel study in Chicago .

Followed by its ambitious Plan for Transformation in Chicago, the HOPE VI program pushed to replace high-rise developments with new mixed-income housing. In the process, the most challenging part was relocation because of four reasons: many households relocated, needy residents, the agency's inexperience for relocation, and residents' mistrust toward the agency. For these reasons, the Chicago

Housing Authority (CHA) started opening education sessions on the relocation process to assist movers. Through the process, residents had three choices: mixed-income housing, voucher, or traditional public housing.

According to the CHA Relocation Counseling Assessment, only 38% of the 190 heads-of-household relocated managed to move to a private market unit with vouchers. The rest of them had to remain in place or moved to another public housing unit. Even movers with vouchers tended to move into neighborhoods that were racially segregated and had lower poverty rates.

The Five-Site Panel Study Follow-up

After the original Panel Study, the second study was conducted in 2003. The study surveyed 736 heads of household with an 85% response rate and interviewed 29 adults and 27 children. Also, the third and final phase was conducted in 2005 with 715 surveys and the same response rate as the second survey and 69 interviews. This study also covered administrative interviews with local HOPE VI staff.

In 2005, 41% of Chicago Panel Study respondents were still living in their original units in Madden (Wells) waiting for relocation. Additionally, 43% of them had moved with a voucher and 5% were living in the new, mixed-income housing. Yet, 8% were not assisted and 1% were homeless. Especially compared with movers with vouchers in the five sites overall(65%), the rate of movers with vouchers in the Chicago site was 22% lower than the average.

Compared with those who moved to other public housing, original residents relocated with vouchers have benefited in some ways: better housing conditions, lower poverty on average, safe neighborhoods, mental health improvement, and fewer behavior problems of their children. This was not only because they were relocated to the better neighborhoods but also they were more likely to be employed and got more school education (Buron, 2007). This difference between public housing residents and voucher holders impacted the outcomes. To be specific, Chicago Madden (Wells) voucher movers were living in less poor neighborhoods than public housing movers. With this relocation, they

felt secure with less violence. For example, 90% of the respondents used to say drug sales and use problems were big problems. However, only 18% of voucher movers answered they still had the same problem in 2005. Not only the adults benefited, but also children's behavior was more positive with 62% of them showing five out of six positive behaviors while only 43% of public housing movers showed the same result.

On the other hand, voucher holders had to struggle with challenging issues. For instance, 63% of them had financial hardships because of high rent and utilities. Furthermore, there were more struggles that most of the original residents had to endure such as poor health and unemployment rates. Firstly, one-fourth reported troubles with physical mobility to the extent they could not even walk three blocks (Manjarrez, 2007). Secondly, the unemployment rates still remained at 48%, as high as it used to be.

HOPE VI Program Limitations

This paper also cited some shortcomings of the HOPE VI program relative to the program goals: the lower return rates after revitalization and quality of Community Supportive Service.

Even with a trial to introduce original residents back to the revitalized neighborhood, only a small number of residents moved back into the new mixed-income housing. This could be because HOPE VI sites usually built fewer public housing units than they demolished. On top of that, sometimes revitalization processes took longer than scheduled which forced movers to stay outside and settle down where they were relocated.

As a critical part of the Community Supportive Services, Chicago set up the Service Connector system to provide case management, information, and referrals to residents. This was a unique system created in Chicago for better public services but it did not have enough staff to help all residents and offer suitable service. For HOPE VI revitalization, the government and agencies including CHA, had already spent millions of dollars for the Service Connector and relocation system. Yet, more considerable investment should be required to deal with the complex needs of the most vulnerable

families. For this reason, the CHA began running a family-focused case management model for its most troubled families. This included a transitional jobs program and long-term follow-up.

Maverick Gardens in Boston (Curley, 2010)

Data and methodology

This HOPE VI evaluation paid more attention to the quality of life of the original residents and presented relocation, perceived safety, and self-sufficiency findings. For this analysis, three different methods were used: data collection, resident surveys, and in-depth interviews. Pre HOPE VI evaluations were compared with the outcomes of the Panel Study as a standard.

Relocation

According to the data, up to 17% of residents were voucher holders, lower than the five-site HOPE VI Panel Study (65%)(Buron, 2007). 3% of residents had been relocated to market-rate housing and 2% of them were able to purchase homes. However, 6% were no longer tracked by the housing authority. The rest of the residents (72%) were relocated to other public housing developments that were relatively higher percentage than the Panel Study average. The poverty rates were 43% in 2000 before HOPE VI revitalization. Compared with the five Panel Study sites poverty rates ranging from 32% to 72%, this rate is average even if it does not show 2010 census data in the exact neighborhood (Popkin, 2002). Also, voucher holders and homeowners moved to fewer non-white concentrated areas (35%) while public housing movers were relocated to areas that were 42% non-white on average (Buron, 2007).

After HOPE VI, return rates were related to unit composition, eligibility, and the time gap between the original relocation and the new units becoming ready to be occupied. According to the

analysis, only half of the original 375 households (48%) had returned to the new HOPE VI community, Maverick Landing even if 75% of them wanted to return. Data also indicated that 23% of residents permanently stayed in other public housing developments. The reasons original residents gave for preferring to stay off-site were that they did not want to move again and not wanting to give up a voucher.

Neighborhood Problems and Safety

Residents' perceived neighborhood problem scores dropped by 56% between pre and post HOPE VI from an average of 0.41 to 0.23. Similar to Panel Study residents, however, this rating depended on how original residents were relocated. When residents moved out with vouchers, they perceived less violence and disorder, while those who moved to other public housing developments were more likely to report more neighborhood problems. The Panel Study especially found that movers with vouchers reported dramatic improvements in safety (Popkin, 2007).

Self-Sufficiency

This outcome can be measured by income, financial situations, burdens on living expenses, employment status, and impact on Community Supportive Service.

Regarding income, the average was $15,500 per year before HOPE VI revitalization, which was less than half the median household income of $47,974. 28% of original residents, however, earned more than $15,500 after HOPE VI revitalization. Also, approximately 13% of original residents felt better regarding financial issues after HOPE VI, but 61% of residents felt the same. This could result from increases in utilities and other living expenses as they moved to private housing neighborhoods. Thus, this showed that financial issues improved only slightly with some income raises and lower perception of financial hardships but more burdens on utilities and food.

Not surprisingly, this study found no impact of HOPE VI on employment rates; this outcome is consistent with the Panel Study before HOPE VI. Specifically, employment was between 40% and 54% depending on the way residents were relocated. Also, most residents (82%) worked in one of the five service-related industries: food service, administrative support, child care, housekeeping/maintenance, or healthcare support getting paid from $2.62 to $24.00 per hour, with an average of $11.85.

In order to evaluate how successful Community Supportive Service has been, job placement and class enrollment would be good indicators. On the one hand, employment services provided Maverick Works which was successful in offering 49 job placements for 35 residents (Curley, 2006). On the other hand, GED, ESOL, and computer training classes saw low enrollment. Overall, Community Supportive Service was helpful to some extent in offering job opportunities to the residents but it is difficult to say the program was completely successful due to lack of enrollment in certain classes.

Park Avenue in Denver (Cloud, 2011)

Data and Research Design

This study was based on a combination of outcome and process evaluation. Using a quasi-experimental design with pre and post project data collection points, the following data were collected from the experimental site and 12 control sites (Shadish, 2001):

- Pre and post qualitative interviews,
- Survey research methods, and
- Field research (i.e., photographs)

Outcomes

In order to assess HOPE VI neighborhood conditions, four different indicators were measured for the HOPE VI site and 12 control sites: crime rates, home-buying activity, property-value growth, and rental rates.

Firstly, violent crimes were considered a key indicator showing the quality of life in a community and the overall attractiveness of a neighborhood. For this analysis, overall and violent crimes between 2001 and 2006 were evaluated before and after HOPE VI revitalization. Park Avenue, the test neighborhood, had a 27% decrease in overall crime but violent crimes increased by 10% in the neighborhood. Although violent crimes increased, it was not a huge increase compared with the overall rates in the city of Denver. During the same period, the violent crimes in Denver increased by 39%. Also, most of the control sites maintained rates similar to the city-wide level. Secondly, home-buying activity was evaluated from 2001 to 2006 before and after HOPE VI. For this to be tracked, the number of mortgage loans was used as an indicator. In the test site, home-buying activity increased by 241% while increasing by only 161% in the control sites. In addition to home-buying activity, pre and post property-value growth could be another indicator. Between 2002 and 2007, property value changed differently depending on property type between the study area and control neighborhoods. To be specific, control neighborhoods had much higher increases in value for single family residential homes, apartments, and office buildings, but for retail and warehouse properties, the value in the study area increased more than in the control sites. Similar to property value growth, rental rates in Post Uptown Square close to the study site increased by 16% between 2004 and 2008.

This study also conducted pre and post interviews with residents, businesses, and organizations in the surrounding community to evaluate qualitative outcomes. According to the owner of a small shop near the study site, customers had changed a little but this did not affect the shop's revenues. Moreover, residents recognized that the number of homeless persons had decreased. Finally,

surrounding organizations reported that crime, policy activity, and emergency vehicles had decreased as well. Through data and interviews, the HOPE VI site showed better outcomes than the 12 control sites in the surrounding area.

CHAPTER 3. HOPE VI IN CHARLOTTE

The three different evaluations covered in the literature review showed markedly different outcomes. For example, 43% of the Madden (Wells) residents in Chicago were located in a private market with vouchers while only 17% of residents moved to a private market with vouchers in Maverick Gardens, Boston. Depending on where residents lived after relocation, their outcomes related to financial struggles and perceived safety varied significantly. Besides relocation, HOPE VI evaluations showed different outcomes depending on site, city, and other factors.

For this reason, it is hard to generalize HOPE VI findings to all of the different HOPE VI sites. Rather, what is important is to evaluate each HOPE VI site in various ways considering both residents and whole neighborhood conditions. Therefore, this paper describes a more appropriate way to evaluate HOPE VI in Charlotte including site selection, choosing adequate indicators, and additional ways to make up previous studies.

In order to evaluate the impacts of HOPE VI revitalization in Charlotte, the first step is to find a HOPE VI site as well as several control sites to compare changes pre and post HOPE VI. The HOPE VI site chosen would reflect the outcomes and control sites would represent a guideline to determine how the HOPE VI results compare to neighborhood trends in the city. Specifically, improvements could be due to neighborhood trends while others are affected by the HOPE VI program, depending on the pattern of outcomes between the HOPE VI site and control sites. For the test site, the year developed and housing units are considered. For control sites, three factors are considered: distance from the HOPE VI site, each neighborhood area, and Median Household Income. These data come from CHA and City-Data.

- HOPE VI Site Data: Basic Neighborhood Information from CHA Property Inventory*[6]

6 http://www.cha-nc.org/page.asp?sort=1&Submit=Filter&mode=view&urh=PropertyInventory

- Control Sites data: Charlotte Neighborhood Map, Neighborhood Area, and Median Household Income from City-Data*[7]

Once sample sites are designated and specific indicators are confirmed, the final consideration of this paper is additional recommendations for assessing the HOPE VI program. The goal is to understand why each HOPE VI program has shown different outcomes and why it is hard to generalize whether or not the program is successful. Given the previous research, the first aspect would be a long-term study tracking original tenants and neighborhood conditions to evaluate consistent or inconsistent impacts of HOPE VI and community developments. If the data are collected about 10 years before and 20 years after HOPE VI, this would be more useful to show neighborhood trends and changes from HOPE VI. Moreover, housing developments in a specific site, whatever programs, mutually affect a comprehensive plan for the overall community developments. Thus, it is crucial to know whether or not HOPE VI developments match the community development. Depending on the goals of the community development plan, the HOPE VI outcomes could vary. Lastly, specific HOPE VI plans vary by site which could impact a variety of findings. For example, each plan has a different number of housing units, various housing types, and different Community Supportive Service programs. All of these detailed factors would impact various outcomes from HOPE VI.

- Long-Term Study
- Community Development Approach
- Detailed HOPE VI Plan

7 http://www.city-data.com/nbmaps/neigh-Charlotte-North-Carolina.html#top

CHAPTER 4. SITE SELECTION IN CHARLOTTE

HOPE VI SITES

For the HOPE VI site, 11 projects have been considered (Table 1.1). To see a long time period and more samples, the older the units and the greater number of units, the better the evaluation. With these standards, either First Ward Place or Arbor Glen would be a better treatment site than other neighborhoods.

Table 1.1 HOPE VI Sites

Neighborhood	Unit (Area*)	Developed Year	Address
First Ward Place	283 (0.458)	1999	550 East 8th St.
Seigle Point Apartments	204	2008	110 Winding Path Way
Montgomery Gardens	76	2006	5200 Beatties Ford Rd.
Nia Point	81	2006	2618 Pitts Dr.
Rivermere Apartments	192	2005	3404 Dunn Commons Pky
The Park at Oaklawn	178	2002	1215 Rising Oak Dr.
Arbor Glen	308 (0.127)	1999	2305 Farmer St.
South Oak Crossing	192	2008	7609 Kings Ridge Dr.
Fairmarket Square	60	1990	5914 Fairmarket Place
Springfield Gardent Apartments	86	2007	9525 Springfield Garden Dr.
Ashley Square at South Park	176	2009	4845 Ashley Park Lane

Source: Charlotte Housing Authority*[8]
*Unit: Square Miles

CONTROL SITES

After a HOPE VI site is chosen, the next step is to find suitable control sites comparable with the test site in terms of distance from the HOPE VI site and the area of each neighborhood. In order to avoid

8 Charlotte Housing Authority Property Inventory: http://www.cha-nc.org/page.asp?sort=1&Submit=Filter&mode=view&urh=PropertyInventory

selecting both the extremely rich and poor neighborhoods, Median Household Income in Charlotte ($52,446)*[9] is also considered. Thus, the area for control sites is all between 0.127 and 0.458 square miles and they are all located within 6 miles from the test site (Cloud, 2011). Moreover, Median Household Income in these sites is similar to the average in Charlotte.

Table 1.2 Control Sites

Neighborhood	Area	Median Rent in 2010	Median Income in 2010
Chantilly	0.359	$578	$55,051
Coliseum Drive	0.281	$623	$47,355
Colonial Village	0.277	$553	$48,031
Commonwealth	0.356	$575	$41,011
Optimist Park	0.403	$646	$41,259
University Park	0.456	$726	$30,576
Villa Heights	0.427	$559	$39,672
Wesley Heights	0.457	$709	$34,256

Source: Charlotte (NC) Neighborhood Map

9 Charlotte (NC) Neighborhood Map: http://www.city-data.com/nbmaps/neigh-Charlotte-North-Carolina.html#N133

CHAPTER 5. INDICATORS OF HOPE VI EVALUATIONS IN CHARLOTTE

QUALITY OF LIFE INDEX IN CHARLOTTE

Based on prior HOPE VI evaluations, quality of life Index in Charlotte is needed. This index was designed to assess the health of neighborhoods in Charlotte and Mecklenburg County and currently has eight quality dimensions: character, economics, education, health, housing, safety, engagement, and environment. Each dimension also has detailed indicators as shown below (Table 1.6).

This study was started in 2003 and the method was updated in 2012. Specifically, it only followed 20 indicators in Charlotte from 2003 to 2010. The number of specific indicators increased to 80 and the geographic area was expanded to Mecklenburg County in 2012. As this study has accumulated continuous data with detailed indicators over the years, this data has offered useful information to show how residents' life and neighborhood conditions are in Charlotte and Mecklenburg County. Thus, this study has helped people and organizations to understand neighborhood dynamics well.

In order to choose appropriate indicators for the evaluations of HOPE VI projects in Charlotte, the indicator screening processes are based on previous studies. The primary concerns are both quality of residents' life and overall neighborhood conditions to show HOPE VI successes and failures. Also, all indicators used more than twice in the former studies were chosen. From this screening, four indicators were selected in the quality of life index created by Charlotte and Mecklenburg County: Median Household Income (MHI), change in residential property value, Median Gross Rent, and violent crime rate. MHI provides an indication of how well residents are doing financially in a neighborhood. Other than MHI, all indicators represent whether or not a neighborhood is in a good condition. For example, property value indicates a market that values a neighborhood's amenities or devalues distressed

conditions. Median Gross Rent also shows a part of quality of living based on location, unit size, design and so on. Finally, violent crime rate can be a good indicator of community safety.

Table 1.6 Quality of Life Indicators

	Indicator		Indicator
Character	Area (in acres)	Housing	Change in residential property value
	Developed tax parcels		Heated square feet of single-family detached dwellings
	Ethnicity - Hispanic/Latino		Housing code violations
	Median age of residents		Housing units
	Population		Median gross rent
	Public transit proximity		Neighborhood nuisance violations
	Race: Asian, Black, Some Other Race, White		New residential building permits
Economics	Median household income		Owner-occupied housing
	Persons employed 6 months or less		Residential building permits (renovation)
	Persons working 35 hours or less		Residential foreclosures
	Population receiving food & nutrition services		Residential housing density
	Square feet of commercial buildings		Residential property value
	Square feet of permitted new and renovated commercial buildings		Single-family rental houses (detached)
	Year commercial buildings constructed		Subsidized housing units
Education	Adults with high school diploma		Vacancy rate
	Children attending private schools		Vacant single family parcels
	EOG test score growth		Year single-family housing constructed
	Dropout rate	Safety	Fire calls for service rate
	Students attending neighborhood schools		Juvenile incident rate
	Students with 10 or more Unexcused absences		Property crime rate
	Number of pre-school programs		Violent crime rate
	Number of school-age programs	Engagement	Registered neighborhood organizations
Health	Age of death		Registered voters
	Births to adolescents	Environment	Length of commute
	Medicaid population		Paved streets with sidewalks
	NC State children's health choice population	Source: Quality of Life Dashboard: Gateway to the Quality of Life Study	
	Residents within 1/2 mile of amenities*	* grocery store, pharmacy, medicaid provider or free clinic, public outdoor recreation area	

INDICATOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Even with some HOPE VI evaluations to determine the program efficiency over the years, it is hard to generalize the same positive or negative results throughout the city, county, or nation. This is because the other sites have not been evaluated in the same way with the same indicators. Depending on a study or site, findings may vary. For this reason, a specific HOPE VI evaluation and outcome cannot be applied to all of the sites. A comprehensive evaluation is needed for each site considering both original residents and neighborhood improvements over a long period of time.

In order to organize a better evaluation overcoming previous limitations, indicators firstly should be set up to match with HOPE VI goals: physical housing condition improvement, residents' self-sufficiency, creating mixed-income communities, and partnerships between public and private sectors. Furthermore, both overall neighborhood characteristics and residents' quality of life year by year for a long time should be considered. Based on HOPE VI objectives, previous studies, and QOL in Charlotte, several indicators were selected if they were used more than twice from the research above. These are also highlighted in grey from Table 1.3 to 1.6 and shown in Table 1.7 as below.

Table 1.7 Indicator Recommendations

	Indicator
Residents' quality of life	Relocation outcomes Change in income Change in employment status
Neighborhood Conditions	Change in crime rate Change in housing value Change in median gross rent

Source: Panel Study (Popkin 2002, 2010), Maverick Gardens in Boston (Curley, 2010), Park Avenue in Denver (Cloud, 2011), Quality of Life Index in Charlotte

CHAPTER 6. ADDITIONAL RESEARCH FOR HOPE VI EVALUATION

LONG-TERM STUDY

The first step for effective HOPE VI evaluations would be a long-term study. This continuous follow up study will help to generalize HOPE VI outcomes depending on where it is located and what community development plans each area has.

All of the past studies evaluated outcomes over a short period. For example, the Panel Study and follow up study were conducted for 6 years from 1999 to 2005. Similarly, Park Avenue in Denver was studied for 7 years between 2001 and 2008. Maverick Gardens in Boston was no exception and lasted a period of 10 years between 2000 and 2010. With these evaluations, it was hard to show past and future long-term changes from pre and post the HOPE VI program. Housing and community developments sometimes lead to improvement right after a specific plan is complete. Most of the developments, however, need time to stabilize and may indicate different results in the short-term and long-term.

For this reason, HOPE VI evaluations should be approached in a long-term sense to know more about long-term changes in neighborhood conditions and residents' quality of life (Matsumoto, 2013). This will contribute to generalization of HOPE VI evaluations by location overall.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT APPROACH

In this section, the significance of multi-dimensional neighborhood amenities is considered because it is obvious that certain amenities impact on both residents' life and neighborhood conditions (Smith, 1978). Depending on amenity improvements, a HOPE VI site shows various findings. Thus,

accessibility to these amenities should be considered in addition to improvement of the HOPE VI sites. In addition, this addresses a plan of the community development in Charlotte, Mecklenburg County in order to see whether the HOPE VI efficiency matches the comprehensive plan and how the plan has affected HOPE VI improvements.

Broadly speaking, there are some indicators to assess the overall community developments and improvements. These are also considered as indicators affecting housing value in a specific neighborhood. Related to community development, four more indicators can be used to recognize whether or not these environmental factors affect HOPE VI projects: accessibility to jobs, grocery shops, schools, and open spaces. Specifically, urban spatial development has been traditionally focused on travel distance and time to work. This means that accessibility to work has been an important factor for community development and to attract people (Smith, 1978). An open space is also a key factor depending on size, the number of trees, and activities (Cho, 2008). These show community improvements and affect housing programs in the neighborhoods. Therefore, neighborhood amenities should be considered as indicators of whether neighborhood conditions have been positively or negatively impacted. This can explain not only HOPE VI improvements but also community developments due to a comprehensive plan.

Additionally, this study also needs to consider a comprehensive community development program in Charlotte, Mecklenburg County. This helps to understand whether or not a HOPE VI program matches the goals in the community development. According to the evaluation of past performance with the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), the funds have assisted with the acquisition and rehabilitation of some properties. Also, the grant helped to install 8,000 linear feet of water line providing public access to drinking water and fire hydrants for Low Median Income (LMI) households. Followed by the objectives of CDBG and five year consolidated plan for CDBG between 2013 and 2018, three outcomes have been expected:

- Improving various public facilities such as parks, sidewalks, and streets;
- Improving public infrastructure (water and sewer) for underserved LMI areas; and
- New community building initiatives.

In addition, this program also plans to promote self-sufficiency and educate children among assisted families with HUD's Moving to Work (MTW) Demonstration Program.

What is important is to plan a HOPE VI site fitting into these comprehensive objectives and evaluate how to improve these factors. With this broad approach, it can be straightforward to divide HOPE VI impacts and CDBG advantages in the neighborhood. By continuing this approach, it is also helpful to evaluate the impact of each amenity in a neighborhood.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PLANNERS

First, planners who want to evaluate the success of a HOPE VI program must implement a long-term study to distinguish consistent or inconsistent improvements. In addition, planners need to consider neighborhood improvements in terms of amenities on a community basis to isolate impacts of HOPE VI developments. Finally, planners need to incorporate considerations of Community Supportive Service programs as it may affect HOPE VI outcomes. Through this additional work, planners may be able to identify ultimate impacts of HOPE VI redevelopment initiatives.

Reference

Ahlbrandt, R. and Cunningham, J. A new public policy for neighborhood preservation. 1979. New York: Praeger.

Barrett, Edith J., Paul Geisel, and Jan Johnston. "The Ramona Utti Report: Impacts of the Ripley Arnold Relocation Program Year 1 (2002–2003)." *Arlington: University of Texas* (2003).

Brophy, Paul C., and Rhonda N. Smith. "Mixed-income housing: Factors for success." *Cityscape* (1997): 3-31.

Buron, Larry, Diane K. Levy, and Megan Gallagher. "Housing Choice Vouchers: How HOPE VI Families Fared in the Private Market." *Urban Institute*, June 2007.

Cho, Seong-Hoon, Neelam C. Poudyal, and Roland K. Roberts. "Spatial Analysis of the Amenity Value of Green Open Space." Ecological Economics 66, no. 2–3 (June 2008): 403–16. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.10.012.

Clegg and Associates. "New Holly Campus of Learners Evaluation." *Seattle: Clegg and Associates*, (2000).

Cloud, William, and Susan Roll. "Denver Housing Authority's Park Avenue HOPE VI Revitalization Project: Community Impact Results." *Housing Policy Debate* 21, no. 2 (March 2011): 191–214. doi:10.1080/10511482.2011.567288.

Curley, Alexandra M., and Joan Fitzgerald. "Fourth year evaluation of the Boston Housing Authority's HOPE VI project at Maverick Gardens'." *Center for Urban and Regional Policy, Northeastern University, Boston* (2006).

Curley, Alexandra M. "HOPE VI–a Viable Strategy for Improving Neighborhood Conditions and Resident Self-Sufficiency? The Case of Maverick Gardens in Boston." *Housing Policy Debate* 20, no. 2 (March 2010): 237–294. doi:10.1080/10511481003738542.

Fogel, Sondra J., Marc T. Smith, and Anne R. Williamson. "Creating New Patterns of Social and Economic Activity Through Planned Housing Environments: HOPE VI and Neighborhood Transformation." *Journal of Community Practice* 15, no. 4 (February 6, 2008): 97–115. doi:10.1300/J125v15n04_05.

Freeman, Lance. "The Impact of Assisted Housing Developments on Concentrated Poverty." *Housing Policy Debate* 14, no. 1–2 (January 2003): 103–141. doi:10.1080/10511482.2003.9521470.

Grigsby, William G., and Steven C. Bourassa. "Section 8: The Time for Fundamental Program Change?" *Housing Policy Debate* 15, no. 4 (January 2004): 805–834. doi:10.1080/10511482.2004.9521522.

Holin, Mary, Larry Buron, Gretchen Locke, and Alvaro Cortes. "Interim assessment of the HOPE VI program cross-site report." *Prepared by Abt Associates for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development* (2003).

Kelly, Michael. "Comment on Susan J. Popkin, Mary K. Cunningham, and Martha Burt's 'public Housing Transformation and the Hard-to-house.'" *Housing Policy Debate* 16, no. 1 (January 2005): 25–35. doi:10.1080/10511482.2005.9521532.

Landis, John D., and Kirk McClure. "Rethinking Federal Housing Policy." Journal of the American Planning Association 76, no. 3 (June 21, 2010): 319–348. doi:10.1080/01944363.2010.484793.

Lyon, L. The Community in urban society. 1987. Philadelphia: *Temple University Press.*

Mast, Brent D., and Ronald E. Wilson. "Housing Choice Vouchers and Crime in Charlotte, NC." *Housing Policy Debate* 23, no. 3 (July 2013): 559–596. doi:10.1080/10511482.2013.794853.

Matsumoto, Kyoko, Yu Mizuno, and Erika Onagi. "The Long-Term Implications of Compensation Schemes for Community Rehabilitation: The Kusaki and Sameura Dam Projects in Japan." *International Journal of Water Resources Development* 29, no. 1 (March 2013): 109–19. doi:10.1080/07900627.2012.738498.

National Bureau of Economic Research. *Means-Tested Transfer Programs in the United States*. Edited by Robert Moffitt. A National Bureau of Economic Research Conference Report. *Chicago: University of Chicago Press,* 2003.

Popkin, Susan J. "HOPE VI Panel Study: Baseline Report: Final Report." *Urban Institute*, September 2002.

Popkin, Susan J. "A Decade of HOPE VI: Research Findings and Policy Challenges." *Urban Institute*, May 2004.

Popkin, Susan J., Diane K. Levy, Laura E. Harris, Jennifer Comey, Mary K. Cunningham, and Larry F. Buron. "The HOPE VI Program: What about the Residents?" *Housing Policy Debate* 15, no. 2 (January 2004): 385–414. doi:10.1080/10511482.2004.9521506.

Popkin, Susan J., and Elizabeth Cove. "Safety Is the Most Important Thing: How HOPE VI Helped Families." *Urban Institute*, June 2007.

Popkin, Susan J. "A Glass Half Empty? New Evidence from the HOPE VI Panel Study." *Housing Policy Debate* 20, no. 1 (January 2010): 43–63. doi:10.1080/10511481003599852.

Rohe, W. "100 Years of Neighborhood Planning." 2009. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 75 (2): 209-230.

Rosenbaum, James E., Linda K. Stroh, and Cathy A. Flynn. "Lake Parc Place: A study of mixed-income housing." (1998): 703-740.

Schwartz, Alex F. *Housing Policy in the United States: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Shadish, William R. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference. *Boston: Houghton Mifflin*, 2001.

Smith, Barton A. "Measuring the value of urban amenities." *Journal of Urban Economics 5*, no. 3 (1978): 370-387.

Stoloff, JA. "A Brief History of Public Housing." *US Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development and Research* (2004).

Sullivan, Thomas P. Independent monitor's report no. 5 to the Chicago Housing Authority and the Central Advisory Council. Chicago: Chicago Housing Authority (2003).

Von Hoffman, Alexander. "A Study in Contradictions: The Origins and Legacy of the Housing Act of 1949." *Housing Policy Debate* 11, no. 2 (March 31, 2010): 299–326. doi:10.1080/10511482.2000.9521370.

Warren, R. The community in America. 1978. *Chicago: Rand McNally.*

Widener University, Center for Social Work Education. "Final Evaluation Report: The Chatham Estates and Wellington Ridge HOPE VI Revitalization Projects of the Chester Housing Authority, 1997-2002." *Chester: Widener University* (2003).

Zielenbach, Sean. "The economic impact of HOPE VI on neighborhoods." *Washington, DC: Housing Research Foundation.* http://www. housingresearch. org (2002).